

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

4-6-2015

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, April 6, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, April 6, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 212.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/212

This Faculty Senate Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
April 6, 2015
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Call to Order

Doug Jackson-Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of March 2, were adopted.

Announcements – Doug Jackson-Smith

Roll Call. Members are reminded to sign the role sheet at each meeting and that absences need to be excused by letting the Executive Secretary know in advance.

Faculty Senate Nominations & Elections. A motion to alter the agenda and open elections early was made by Ronda Callister and seconded by Sheri Haderlie. The motion passed unanimously.

Nominations for FS President Elect were made by Becki Lawver who nominated Dr. Lindsey Shirley, and by John Stevens who nominated Dr. David Brown. Each nominee accepted their nomination and were given 2 minutes to briefly tell the senate about themselves. Voting will be done by email and overseen by Joan Kleinke and Sheri Haderlie.

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett

President Albrecht was not in attendance at this meeting. Provost Cockett asked Neil Abercrombie and Dave Cowley to give a brief legislative outcomes update. Overall, there was a 4.9% increase to higher education. Included in that is a 2% compensation increase. All employees will receive a 1% COLA increase and the remaining will be distributed as seen fit by the Deans. BFW is meeting with President Albrecht on Wednesday to discuss the role of faculty in the process of deciding how to allocate compensation increases.

Several buildings and capital development projects will move forward. The Student Recreation Center is scheduled for completion by Thanksgiving. The addition to the Business building is scheduled for completion next spring. Renovation of the Kent Concert Hall and an addition to the Fine Arts center will begin this summer. The Art Barn will be torn down and replaced with a Welcome Center and Alumni Relations building, built by USU Credit Union which will have offices on the first floor. Romney Stadium will also undergo renovation, receiving a new press box, premium seating and improved restroom concession facilities.

Information Items

Gun Survey – Doug Jackson-Smith. Faculty Senate Presidents from across the USHE system have met to discuss this issue. They have drafted a survey of faculty to get more feedback. The draft was included in our agenda packet – please let Doug know if you have any specific feedback, concerns, or suggestions. We are waiting for all the USHE institutions to weigh in before launching; as a result it is likely to be implemented in the early fall.

Reports

PRPC Annual Report – Stephen Bialkowski.

March EPC Items – Larry Smith. Larry highlighted a few items from the report, including action items from the Academic Standards Subcommittee who acted on 2 R401 requests; the first was a discontinuation of MA in Sociology and the creation of a multi-disciplined PhD Program in Neuroscience that will be under the Psychology Department.

FDDE Annual Report – Britt Fagerheim. Britt presented highlights of the report documenting trends in the representation of female and non-white faculty by college (compared to their availability in the national pool of faculty in the appropriate disciplines). This report is designed to be updated each year, but has not been completed for two years. The AAA and AA/EO office are helping FDDE set up a system to make updating of the report easier in future years.

There was concern from a few senators about some wording in the report and that voting to accept the report would indicate support of it. The Parliamentarian clarified that the report could be accepted and that it did not become the view of the senate.

A motion to vote to approve each report separately was received and seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

A motion to approve the PRPC Report was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the EPC Report was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the FDDE Report was made and seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Unfinished Business

405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T (Second Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

A motion to pass the second reading of 405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T was made by Robert Schmidt. A second was received and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

402.9 Code Change: Scheduling of Faculty Forum (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

Doug Jackson-Smith led a short discussion about changing the codified timing of the Faculty Forum so as not to eliminate the November Faculty Senate Meeting and add another time for Faculty Forum. A senator asked why we were targeting October or November for the Forum. Doug replied that FSEC discussions concluded that September was too soon, December too busy, and spring too late to be useful for guiding faculty senate activities. Allowing the forum to take place on a date in October or November will provide time for planning, but ensure it is done at a time when faculty might be able to participate and the results to be used by faculty leaders to guide their activities. The code change will return at the next meeting for a second reading and vote.

405.12.2 (1-3) Code Changes: PTR (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. Doug provided a brief review of the process leading to a proposed code change draft on post-tenure review. The code change draft being discussed today was produced by the PRPC in response to a request by the faculty senate in January. Today's discussion serves as the first reading of the draft, and there is an opportunity for senators to ask clarifying questions and propose edits to the draft to ensure it meets the intent of the senate.

Alan Stephens, Chair of the BFW committee, expressed several concerns with this code change and purported that other Faculty Senate committees oppose it as well.

Alan Stephens made a motion to table the discussion on this issue. Jake Gunther seconded.

Discussion continued on whether or not the proposal has the support of other committees. AFT representatives indicated that they did not vote to oppose the proposal, but have expressed concerns about a number of process details (which could be fixed with amendments). Their primary concern centered the definition of the term "collegiality", and whether the process would meet NWCCU accreditation expectations for an evaluation of all faculty in a 'regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner' at least every 5 years.

Doug and Ronda noted that faculty senate leaders met with the Department Heads Executive Committee. The notes from that meeting indicated the response was generally favorable, with one concern about the 5 year waiting period before action could be taken (DHs are concerned that they will have no recourse during the 5 years post-tenure or promotion decision if a faculty member 'flat lines').

Mark McClellan called the question on the motion to table the item. Voting was unanimous in support of the motion to call to question.

The vote on the motion to table the code draft failed.

Doug Jackson-Smith reviewed the code draft for the senate and the recommendations for two amendments that received the support of the FSEC.

A motion was made to limit the review to no more than every 5 years and a second was received. Arguments in favor were to avoid a faculty member being sent into the Peer Review Committee process every other year by a vindictive department head. Arguments against pointed to the role of faculty peers in the PRC that protect the faculty from consequences associated with an unfair department evaluation, an internal check and balance (where a DH whose referral is repeatedly overturned by the PRC will eventually undermine the credibility of the DH), and the need to have some mechanism to deal with tenured faculty who are no longer meeting the expectations of their position. The motion failed by voice vote.

Discussion then turned to the first amendment supported by the FSEC on an appeals process to read as follows:

1) Add sentence to specify that an appeals process will be followed if mutual agreement between the faculty member and department head on membership on a PRC is not possible. New material would start on line 172 (end of fourth paragraph under 406.12.2).

a. Option 1 (preferred by FSEC): **"If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC."**

b. Option 2: "If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements."

Scott Bates moved to adopt option 1; the motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt. A lengthy discussion followed with several attempts to wordsmith the amendments.

Ronda Callister made a friendly amendment and a second was received to add “the CFAC would consist of one person nominated from each college and election by faculty of no less than 3 members”.

Robert Schmidt withdrew his second, thereby eliminating the original motion by Scott Bates.

Stephen Bialkowski moved to support option 2 and a second was received.

An amendment to this motion was made and seconded that merged the two options to read: “If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC if a CFAC does not exist, individual department and/or university appeals processes will be used to resolve the issue.”

The motion to amend the amendment passed with one dissenting vote. Voting on the motion to amend (as amended) passed with two dissenting votes.

The second suggested amendment from the FSEC dealt with timelines and clarified that the peer review committee must actually meet. Doug presented the proposal from FSEC:

Clarify that the Peer Review Committee should meet and establish deadlines for the process. Add three new sentences on line 185 (before 'For any meeting...')

"These materials should be provided to the PRC within 3 weeks of the appointment of the committee. Within 4 weeks after receiving these materials, the PRC shall schedule a meeting to discuss their evaluation of the faculty member's post-tenure performance. At this meeting, the faculty member and department head should be allowed to make oral presentations to the committee."

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the FSEC proposal. Charles Waugh suggested a friendly amendment to change the words “shall schedule a meeting” to “shall meet”. The friendly amendment was accepted. An amendment to the motion was proposed and seconded to delete the words “and department head”. The amendment to the motion was accepted with two dissenting votes. Voting on the motion to accept the FSEC proposal as amended was unanimous.

405.6.5 Code Change: Remove term Quinquennial (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. Due to time limitations this item was not discussed.

Mutual Agreement code change - Doug Jackson-Smith. Due to time limitations this item was not discussed.

Adjournment. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.